



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
at Chandigarh**

107

CRM-M-54990-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 29.09.2025

Vakul Rana ... Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory of Chandigarh ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Mr. Fery Jain, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J.** (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.188 dated 03.09.2025, registered under Sections 316(5), 318(4), 338 and 340(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, at Police Station Sector 36, Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has taken a due sanction from the authority and uploaded the bill on PFMS portal and everything is digitalized and the allegation against him is just to make him scapegoat.

3. Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T., Chandigarh assisted by Inderjit Sharma, Superintendent, Accounts Branch, has submitted that the present petitioner has forged and fabricated the bill which is not due towards the department and got these sanctioned from the treasury with the help of some



CRM-M-54990-2025 (O&M)

( 2 )

treasury officials and received the amount in his account and as per the enquiry, upto date more than Rs. 35 Lakh has been embezzled. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for his specimen signature, *modus operandi* and the involvement of other officials of the treasury department or his own department. During investigation, it revealed that he has transferred the amount from his account to his relatives and money trail is to be tracked for its recovery from petitioner.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the allegations against the present petitioner that he embezzled the amount more than Rs.35 Lakh of the Sports Department, Chandigarh by forging electricity and water consumption bills and received the amount in his personal account, wherefrom he has transferred this amount in the name of his relatives, his custodial interrogation is required to unearth the entire case. The anticipatory bail cannot be granted to the accused wherein custodial interrogation is required to track the money trail and recovery of embezzled amount. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806' decided on 03.08.1997***, wherein it has been held as under:-

*"...custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation orientated than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the*



CRM-M-54990-2025 (O&amp;M)

( 3 )

*time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring would not conduct themselves as offenders.”*

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

**29.09.2025**

Geeta

**( SUBHAS MEHLA )  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No